arXiv:1612.09514v1 [cs.LO] 30 Dec 2016

A GHOST AT ω_1

PAUL BLAIN LEVY

University of Birmingham
e-mail address: P.B.Levy@cs.bham.ac.uk

Abstract. In the final chain of the countable powerset functor, we show that the set at index ω_1, regarded as a transition system, is not strongly extensional because it contains a "ghost" element that has no successor even though its component at index 1 is nonempty.

For Jirka Adámek on his 70th birthday, with thanks for his many contributions and his inspiration.

1. Introduction

Initial algebras and final coalgebras of endofunctors are important in many areas of mathematics and computer science. One versatile way of constructing an initial algebra of F is to form the *initial chain* [Adá74], a transfinite sequence of objects, by applying F at each successor ordinal and taking a colimit at each limit ordinal. Provided the initial chain stabilizes, this yields an initial algebra μF. Dually [Bar93], we form the *final chain* $(\nu^{(i)}F)_i$, by applying F at each successor ordinal and taking a limit at each limit ordinal. Provided the final chain stabilizes, this yields a final coalgebra νF.

These constructions make sense for any endofunctor on any category, provided the relevant colimits or limits exist. But certain endofunctors on **Set** have received particular attention: the powerset functor ($\mathcal{P}$) and its subfunctors, notably finite powerset and countable powerset ($\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$), which send a set to its set of finite or countable subsets respectively. That is because these functors have many applications, e.g. nondeterministic automata, program semantics and foundations of set theory. The $\mathcal{P}$ functor does not have an initial algebra or final coalgebra, for cardinality reasons; when we refer to $\mu\mathcal{P}$ or $\nu\mathcal{P}$, these are proper classes. By contrast, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{f}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ do have a (small) initial algebra and final coalgebra.

Now the initial chains of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{f}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ are easy to understand: each is an increasing sequence of subsets of the initial algebra. But the final chains are more subtle. Their form was established in [ALM$^+$15, Wor05].

- $\nu^{(\omega)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{f}}$ consists of the final coalgebra together with some junk. The next ω steps in the final chain of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{f}}$ remove this junk, and the chain stabilizes at $\omega + \omega$.
- $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ consists of the final coalgebra together with some junk. The next ω steps in the final chain of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ remove this junk, and the chain stabilizes at $\omega_1 + \omega$.

These descriptions may give the impression that the final chains of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{f}}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ are essentially similar. However, they tell only part of the story. For $\nu^{(\omega)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{f}}$, as well as being a *superset* of $\nu\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{f}}$, is also a *subset* of $\nu\mathcal{P}$. This is because it can be endowed with a transition relation

LOGICAL METHODS
IN COMPUTER SCIENCE
DOI:10.2168/LMCS-???
© Paul Blain Levy
Creative Commons

(spelt out below) that makes it into a *strongly extensional* transition system, i.e. one where bisimilarity is equality. More specifically, $\nu^{(\omega)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{f}$ at ω was characterized [Wor05] as the set of *compactly branching* elements[1] of $\nu\mathcal{P}$, also studied in [Abr05, KV04]. While all these elements are compactly branching, they are not all finitely (or even countably) branching, and the extra ω steps are required to remove those that are not, so that only the finitely branching trees remain.

Is there a similar story for $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$? The question is asked in [ALM$^+$15]. This set too can be endowed with a transition relation. But the resulting transition system is not strongly extensional. We demonstrate this by giving two distinct elements that are "dead" in the sense of having no successor. One of these is the expected dead element: all its components are empty. The other's components are all nonempty. Since the latter "appears to be alive", yet is dead, we call it a *ghost*.

Thus we see a significant difference between $\nu^{(\omega)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{f}$ and $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$. An element of $\nu^{(\omega)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{f}$ may lie outside the final coalgebra of $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{f}$, but only because it is not finitely branching. By contrast, an element of $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$ may lie outside the final coalgebra of $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$ despite having no successors at all.

Related work. While our result may surprise readers familiar with the final chain of $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{f}$, it will probably not surprise readers familiar with [FH89][Lemma 2.2] or [LR96][Theorem 15]. The proof of each of these essentially exhibits a ghost at ω_1 in the final chain of $\mathcal{P}$. And they go further by obtaining similar phenomena at larger ordinals, and much else. We strengthen the result in a different direction by exhibiting a ghost in the final chain of $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$. This is significant because the final coalgebra of $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$ plays an important role in the semantics of countably nondeterministic programs.

2. Conventions

- We write $\mathsf{Ord}^{\mathsf{op}}$ for the large category with an object i for each ordinal i and a morphism $(i \geqslant j) \;:\; i \to j$ for ordinals $i \geqslant j$. Likewise we write i^{op} for the full subcategory consisting of ordinals $< i$.
- An ordinal i *has cofinality* ω when it is the supremum of a chain $i_0 < i_1 < \cdots$. This implies that, for any chain $D \;:\; i^{\mathsf{op}} \to \mathbf{Set}$, every element of $\lim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} D_{i_n}$ extends uniquely to an element of $\lim_{j<i} D_j$.
- An *extended cardinal* is either a cardinal or ∞, and κ always denotes an extended cardinal. A *regular infinite extended cardinal* is either a regular infinite cardinal or ∞.
- For any set A, we write $\mathcal{P}_\kappa A$ for the set of $U \subset A$ with cardinality $< \kappa$. Thus $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ is an endofunctor on $\mathbf{Set}$, and a monad if κ is regular and infinite. In particular, $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{f} = \mathcal{P}_{\aleph_0}$ and $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c} = \mathcal{P}_{\aleph_1}$.
- Any non-successor ordinal is a *limit*, including 0.
- For an ordinal i, we write $\mathsf{pred}(i)$ for the least upper bound of all ordinals $< i$. Thus $\mathsf{pred}(i)$ is j if $i = j + 1$, and i if i is a limit.
- A *transition system* is a set X with relation $\rightsquigarrow \subseteq X \times X$.

[1] Elements of $\nu\mathcal{P}$ are represented in [ALM$^+$15, Wor05] as isomorphism classes of strongly extensional trees.

- If $(X, \rightsquigarrow)$ and $(Y, \rightsquigarrow)$ are transition systems, we define a decreasing Ord-indexed sequence $(\sim_i)_i$ of relations between X and Y, called *approximants to bisimilarity*. Explicitly, $x \sim_{i+1} x'$ when for every successor y of x there is a successor y' of x' such that $y \sim_i y'$ and vice versa. If i is a limit then $\sim_i$ is $\bigcap_{j<i} \sim_j$. In particular, $\sim_0$ is $X \times Y$.

3. Final chains

This section reprises the theory of final coalgebras and final chains [Adá74, Bar93]. Let F be an endofunctor on a category $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 3.1.

(1) An F-coalgebra is a $\mathcal{C}$-object X and morphism $\zeta : X \to FX$. These give the category of F-coalgebras, where an F-coalgebra morphism $(X, \zeta) \to (Y, \xi)$ is a morphism $f : X \to Y$ such that
$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\zeta} & FX \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Ff} \\ Y & \xrightarrow[\xi]{} & FY \end{array}$$
(2) An F-algebra is a $\mathcal{C}$-object X and morphism $\theta : FX \to X$, and we likewise obtain the category of F-algebras.
(3) A morphism [Epp99, Tay99] from an F-coalgebra (X, ζ) to an F-algebra (Y, θ) is a $\mathcal{C}$-morphism $f : X \to Y$ such that
$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\zeta} & FX \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle Ff} \\ Y & \xleftarrow[\theta]{} & FY \end{array}$$
commutes. This may be precomposed with a coalgebra morphism or postcomposed with an algebra morphism.

Definition 3.2. Let $\mathcal{C}$ have (distinguished) limits. The *final chain* of F is a functor $\mathsf{Ord}^{\mathsf{op}} \to \mathcal{C}$. Thus it consists of an object $\nu^{(i)}F$ for each ordinal i and connecting maps $\nu^{(i \geqslant j)}F : \nu^{(i)}F \longrightarrow \nu^{(j)}F$ for all $j \leqslant i$. The latter is usually written just $\nu^{(i \geqslant j)}$. These objects and maps are given as follows.

- $\nu^{(i+1)}F = F(\nu^{(i)}F)$.
- $\nu^{(i+1 \geqslant j+1)} = F\nu^{(i \geqslant j)}$ for $j \leqslant i$.
- If i is a limit then $\nu^{(i)}F$ is the limit of $(\nu^{(j)}F)_{j<i}$ with projections $(\nu^{(i \geqslant j)})_{j<i}$.
- In particular $\nu^{(0)}F = 1$.

Proposition 3.3.

(1) For every ordinal i, the algebra $(\nu^{(i)}F, \nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i)})$ is corecursive [CUV09, Tay99]*, meaning that for every F-coalgebra $M = (X, \zeta)$ there is a unique map $p_{M,i} : M \to (\nu^{(i)}F, \nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i)})$.*

(2) Explicitly, $p_{M,i+1}$ is $X \xrightarrow{\zeta} FX \xrightarrow{Fp_{M,i}} F\nu^{(i)}F$.

(3) For ordinals $j \leqslant i$, the connecting map $\nu^{(i \geqslant j)} : (\nu^{(j)}F, \nu^{(j+1 \geqslant j)}) \to (\nu^{(i)}F, \nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i)})$ is an F-algebra map. □

Corollary 3.4.

- $$\begin{array}{ccc} X & & \\ {\scriptstyle p_{(X,\zeta),i}}\downarrow & \searrow^{p_{(X,\zeta),j}} & \\ \nu^{(j)}F & \xleftarrow[\nu^{(i\geqslant j)}]{} & \nu^{(i)}F \end{array}$$ *commutes for every F-coalgebra (X,ζ) and ordinals $j \leqslant i$.*
- $$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle p_{(X,\zeta),i}}\downarrow & \swarrow_{p_{(Y,\xi),i}} & \\ \nu^{(i)}F & & \end{array}$$ *commutes for every map $f : (X,\zeta) \to (Y,\xi)$ and ordinal i.* □

The final chain gives a way of obtaining a final coalgebra.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose the final chain of F is* stable at i*, i.e. $\nu^{(i+1\geqslant i)}$ is an isomorphism.*

- *$\nu^{(k\geqslant j)}$ is an isomorphism for all $k \geqslant j \geqslant i$.*
- *The F-coalgebra $(\nu^{(i)}F, (\nu^{(i+1\geqslant i)})^{-1})$ is final.*
- *The map $p_{(\nu^{(i)}F,(\nu^{(i+1\geqslant i)})^{-1}),j}$ is given by $\nu^{(i\geqslant j)}$.* □

Proposition 3.6. *Let M and N be transition systems regarded as $\mathcal{P}$-coalgebras, and let i be an ordinal. For $x \in M$ and $y \in N$, we have $x \sim_i y$ iff $p_{M,i}x = p_{N,i}y$.*

4. Injections and surjections

When we study the final chain of an endofunctor on **Set**, the key question is which connecting maps are injective and which are surjective. This relies on the following notions.

Definition 4.1. A cone over a diagram $D : \mathbb{I} \to \mathbf{Set}$ is a *sublimit* (resp. *limit-cover*) when the cone morphism from the cone to the limit of D is injective (resp. surjective).

We may thus ask whether a functor preserves sublimits, or limit-covers, of certain diagrams. Note that F preserves limit-covers of the empty diagram iff $F1$ is nonempty.

Proposition 4.2.

(1) Let κ be a regular infinite cardinal. Then $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ preserves sublimits of κ^{op}-chains.
(2) Let $\kappa > 0$ be a cardinal. Then $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ preserves limit-covers of the empty diagram.
(3) Let $\kappa > \aleph_0$ be a regular extended cardinal. Then $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ preserves limit-covers of ω^{op}-chains.

Proof. (1) is proved in [Wor05] and (2) is trivial. For (3), let

$$D_0 \xleftarrow{D_{1\geqslant 0}} D_1 \xleftarrow{D_{2\geqslant 1}} D_2 \cdots$$

be an ω^{op}-chain with limit-cover $(V,(r_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}})$. Let $u \in \lim_n \mathcal{P}_\kappa D_n$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $u_n = (\mathcal{P}_\kappa D_{n+1\geqslant n})u_{n+1}$ i.e. $D_{n+1\geqslant n}$ restricts to a surjection $u_{n+1} \to u_n$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in u_n$ we obtain $p^{n,x} \in V$ that is sent by r_n to x and by r_k, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, to an element of u_k. To show this, it suffices to obtain $a \in \lim_n D_n$ whose nth component is x and whose kth component, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, is an element of u_k. We obtain a by first setting $a_k = D_{n\geqslant k}u_n$ for all $k \leqslant n$, then we successively define $a_k \in u_k$ for all $k > n$ by letting a_{k+1} be some $k+1$-development of a_k in u_{k+1}.

Now put $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{p^{n,x} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in u_n\} \subseteq V$. The cardinality of C is $< \kappa$ because κ is regular and uncountable, so $C \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa V$. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$(\mathcal{P}_\kappa r_k)C = \{p_k^{n,x} \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, x \in u_n\}$$

and we claim that this is u_k. For inclusion, we know that $p_k^{n,x} \in u_k$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in u_n$. Conversely, given $x \in u_k$, we have $x = p_k^{k,x}$. Hence

$$((\mathcal{P}_\kappa r_k)C)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} = u$$

So $(\mathcal{P}_\kappa r_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} : \mathcal{P}_\kappa V \to \lim_n \mathcal{P}_\kappa D_n$ is surjective. □

Having considered properties of specific functors, let us consider in general when connecting maps are injective, following [Wor05].

Proposition 4.3. *Let κ be a regular infinite cardinal.*

(1) Let F be a functor that preserves sublimits of κ^{op}-chains. For $j \geqslant i \geqslant \kappa$, the connecting map $\nu^{(j\geqslant i)}$ is injective.

(2) If, moreover, F preserves arbitrary intersections, then the final chain is stable at $\kappa + \omega$. □

We conclude that the final chain of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ is stable at $\kappa+\omega$. It is shown in [ALM$^+$15] that it is not stable at any smaller ordinal.

Definition 4.4. An element of $\nu^{(i)}F$ is said to be *F-coalgebraic* when it in the range of $p_{M,i}x$ for some F-coalgebra M.

- We may take M to be the final coalgebra of F, if it exists.
- Every F-coalgebraic element is in the range of $\nu^{(j\geqslant i)}$ for all $j \geqslant i$.

Proposition 4.5. *For any ordinal i, the following are equivalent.*

(1) $\nu^{(i+1\geqslant i)}$ is surjective.

(2) $\nu^{(j\geqslant i)}$ is surjective for all $j \geqslant i$.

(3) All elements of $\nu^{(i)}F$ are F-coalgebraic.

Proof. **(3) ⇒ (2) ⇒ (1):**] Trivial.

(1) ⇒ (3): $\nu^{(i+1\geqslant i)}$ has a section $\zeta : \nu^{(i)}F \to \nu^{(i+1)}F$. Put $M = (\nu^{(i)}F, \zeta)$. For all $j \leqslant i$, we show $p_{M,j} = \nu^{(i\geqslant j)}$ by induction on j. The limit case is trivial. For the successor case, $p_{M,j} = \nu^{(i\geqslant j)}$ implies $Fp_{M,j} = F\nu^{(i\geqslant j)} = \nu^{(i+1\geqslant j+1)}$ and hence



We conclude that $p_{M,i}$ is the identity. □

Proposition 4.6.

(1) For an ordinal i, if every element of $\nu^{(i)}F$ is F-coalgebraic then so is every element of $\nu^{(i+n)}F$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
(2) If F preserves terminal objects up to a surjection (i.e. $F1$ is nonempty), and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then every element of $\nu^{(n)}F$ is F-coalgebraic.
(3) If F preserves limit covers of ω^{op}-chains and i is an ordinal of cofinality ω and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then every element of $\nu^{(i+n)}F$ is F-coalgebraic.

Proof.

(1) By induction on n. Since $\nu^{(i+n+1 \geqslant i+n)}$ is surjective, i.e. split epi, $\nu^{(i+n+2 \geqslant i+n+1)} = F\nu^{(i+n+1 \geqslant i+n)}$ is too.
(2) $\nu^{(1 \geqslant 0)}$ is the unique map $F1 \to 1$ so it is surjective.
(3) Let i be the supremum of $i_0 < i_1 < \ldots$. Then $\nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i)}$ is the cone morphism $F \lim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \nu^{(i_n)}F \to \lim_{n\in\mathbb{N}} F\nu^{(i_n)}F$, which is surjective. □

Corollary 4.7. *Let $\kappa > \aleph_0$ be a cardinal, and let $i < \omega_1$.*

(1) Every element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ is $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$-coalgebraic.
(2) For all $j \geqslant i$, the map $\nu^{(j \geqslant i)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ is surjective.

Proof. Every ordinal i is of the form $j + n$ where j is a limit and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If i is countable, then j either is 0 or has cofinality ω. We apply Propositions 4.5–4.6. □

Remark 4.8. If F preserves ω^{op}-chains up to a surjection, then an F-coalgebraic element of $\nu^{(i)}F$ is one in the range of $\nu^{(i+\omega \geqslant i)}$. (Because every element of $\nu^{(i+\omega)}F$ is F-coalgebraic.) We may ask whether every element of $\nu^{(i)}F$ that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is in the range of $\nu^{(i+n \geqslant i)}$ is F-coalgebraic. This is an open question e.g. for $F = \mathcal{P}$ and $i = \omega_1$.

5. The final chain of $\mathcal{P}$ as a transition system

In the final chain of $\mathcal{P}$, we shall define a relation $\rightsquigarrow \subseteq \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P} \times \nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i))}\mathcal{P}$. Intuitively this makes the final chain into a transition system: starting from an element of $\nu^{(\alpha+n)}\mathcal{P}$, where α is a limit and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we travel n steps down the chain until we hit α, and then we continue moving inside $\nu^{(\alpha)}\mathcal{P}$.

The general definition is as follows.

Definition 5.1. Let $x \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ and $y \in \nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i))}\mathcal{P}$. We write $x \rightsquigarrow y$ when $\nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant j)}y_j \in \nu^{(i \geqslant j+1)}x$ for all $j < i$.

This may be simplified in specific cases:

- If $i = j + 1$ then $x \rightsquigarrow y$ iff $y \in x$.
- If i is a limit then $x \rightsquigarrow y$ iff $y_j \in x_{j+1}$ for all $j < i$.
- If $i = 0$ then $() \rightsquigarrow ()$.
- If i is the supremum of $i_0 < i_1 < \cdots$ then $x \rightsquigarrow y$ iff $y_{i_n} \in x_{i_n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following is occasionally useful.

Proposition 5.2. *Let i be a limit ordinal, and let $a \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ and $b \in \nu^{(i+1)}\mathcal{P}$. Then b is an $i + 1$-extension of a iff the following conditions hold.*

(1) Every element of b is a successor of a.
(2) For all $j < i$, every element of the component a_{j+1} has an i-development in b.

If i is the supremum of $i_0 < i_1 < \cdots$, we may cut down condition (2):

- *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every element of $A_{i_n+1,i}a$ has an i-development in b.*

Proof. $a = \nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i)}b$ iff, for all $j < i$, we have $\nu^{(i \geqslant j+1)}a$ equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \nu^{(i \geqslant j+1)}\nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i)}b &= \nu^{(i+1 \geqslant j+1)}b \\ &= \mathcal{P}_\kappa \nu^{(i \geqslant j)}b \\ &= \{\nu^{(i \geqslant j)}y \mid y \in b\} \end{aligned}$$

Condition (1) is $(\supseteq)$ for all $j < i$, and condition (2) is $(\subseteq)$ for all $j < i$. □

We give some basic properties of the transition relation.

Proposition 5.3.

(1) Let $i \leqslant j$ and $a \in \nu^{(j)}\mathcal{P}$. If $a \rightsquigarrow b$ then $\nu^{(j \geqslant i)}a \rightsquigarrow \nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(j) \geqslant \mathsf{pred}(i))}$.

(2) Let M be a transition system, let $x \in M$ and let i be an ordinal. If $x \rightsquigarrow y$ then $p_{M,i}x \rightsquigarrow p_{M,\mathsf{pred}(i)}y$ for all i.

(3) Let κ be a regular infinite cardinal and $i \geqslant \kappa$. For any $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$-coalgebra M and $x \in M$, every successor of $p_{M,i}x$ is $p_{M,\mathsf{pred}(i)}y$ for some successor y of x. In particular $\nu\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ is a subsystem of $\nu^{(\kappa)}\mathcal{P}$.

Proof.

(1) Immediate from the way we defined $\rightsquigarrow$.

(2) We proceed by induction on i. The successor case follows from

$$p_{M,j+1}x = \{p_{M,j}y \mid x \rightsquigarrow y\} \tag{5.1}$$

(3) Let b be a successor of $p_{M,i}x$. For each successor y of x, suppose that $b \neq p_{M,\mathsf{pred}(i)}y$. Injectivity of $\nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant \kappa)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ gives $\nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant \kappa)}b \neq p_{M,\kappa}y$, i.e. there is $j(y) < \kappa$ such that $\nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant j(y))}b \neq p_{M,j(y)}y$. Since κ is regular, the set $\{j(y) \mid x \rightsquigarrow y\}$ has an upper bound $j < \kappa$. But $\nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant j)}b \in p_{M,j+1}x$, so by (5.1) x has a successor y such that $p_{M,j}y = \nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant j)}b$, contradiction. □

Proposition 5.4. *Let $j + 1 \leqslant i$ be ordinals. Let $a \in \nu^{(j+1)}\mathcal{P}$ have $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$-coalgebraic i-development b. Then every successor (i.e. element) of a has a $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$-coalgebraic $\mathsf{pred}(i)$-development that is a successor of b.*

Proof. Let $b = p_{M,i}x$, where M is a $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$-coalgebra. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \nu^{(i \geqslant j+1)}b \\ &= p_{M,j+1}x \\ &= \{p_{M,j}y \mid x \rightsquigarrow y\} \end{aligned}$$

If $c \in a$ then $c = p_{M,j}y$ for some successor y of x. So $p_{M,\mathsf{pred}(i)}y$ is a $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$-coalgebraic $\mathsf{pred}(i)$-development of a and, by Proposition 5.3(2), a successor of b. □

Proposition 5.5. *Let M be a transition system, $x \in M$ and $i < \omega_1$. Then $p_{M,i}x$ is the unique $a \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ such that $x \sim_i a$.*

Proof. We first show that $j \leqslant i$ implies $x \sim_j p_{M,i}x$, by induction on j. The limit case is straightforward. For $j+1 \leqslant i$, we show $x \sim_{j+1} p_{M,i}x$ as follows.

- Suppose $x \rightsquigarrow y$. Then $p_{M,i}x \rightsquigarrow p_{M,\mathsf{pred}(i)}y$ by Proposition 5.3(2), and $y \sim_j p_{M,\mathsf{pred}(i)}y$ by inductive hypothesis.
- Suppose $p_{M,i}x \rightsquigarrow b$. Since $\mathsf{pred}(i) < \omega_1$, we know that b is coalgebraic i.e. $b = p_{N,\mathsf{pred}(i)}y$ for some system N and $y \in N$. So $p_{M,j+1}x \rightsquigarrow p_{N,j}y$ i.e. $p_{N,j}y \in p_{M,j+1}x$. By equation (5.1), x has a successor u such that $p_{M,j}u = p_{N,j}y$, i.e. $u \sim_j y$ by Proposition 3.6. The inductive hypothesis gives $y \sim_j p_{N,i}y = b$ so $u \sim_j b$.

Thus we have $x \sim_i p_{M,i}x$. If $x \sim_i p_{N,i}x'$ then $p_{N,i}x' \sim_i x'$ gives $x \sim_i x'$ and so $p_{M,i}x = p_{N,i}x'$ by Proposition 3.6. □

Corollary 5.6.

(1) If $i < \omega_1$ and $a, a' \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ and $a \sim_i a'$ then $a = a'$.
(2) If $j \leqslant i < \omega_1$ and $a \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ then $\nu^{(i \geqslant j)}a \sim_j a$.

Proof. Because all elements of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ are $\mathcal{P}$-coalgebraic. □

Definition 5.7. Let M be the transition system with a single element 0 and no transitions. For each ordinal i we put $0(i) = p_{M,i}0$.

Explicitly, $0(i)$ is the empty set if i is a successor, and $(0(j))_{j<i}$ if i is a limit. If $i \geqslant 1$ we can characterize $0(i)$ in other ways.

- It is the unique element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ sent by $\nu^{(i \geqslant 1)}$ to the empty set. All other elements are sent to the singleton (the only other element of $\nu^{(1)}\mathcal{P}$).
- It is the unique $\mathcal{P}$-coalgebraic element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ with no successor.

So far we have considered only the final chain of $\mathcal{P}$, not that of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa$. The latter is a subsystem of the former:

Proposition 5.8. *If $x \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$ and $x \rightsquigarrow y$ then $y \in \nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i))}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$.*

Proof. For all $j < i$ we have

$$\nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant j)}y \in \nu^{(i \geqslant j+1)}x \in \nu^{(j+1)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa = \mathcal{P}_\kappa \nu^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$$

giving $\nu^{(\mathsf{pred}(i) \geqslant j)}y \in \nu^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$. Whether i is a successor or a limit, we conclude $y \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_\kappa$. □

6. A Ghost at ω_1

Let us summarize the properties of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ that we have seen, for $i < \omega_1$.

(1) Every element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$ is $\mathcal{P}$-coalgebraic, by Proposition 4.6.
(2) If $j+1 \leqslant i$ then for all $a \in \nu^{(j+1)}\mathcal{P}$ with i-development b, every successor (i.e. element) of a has an $\mathsf{pred}(i)$-development that is a successor of b, by Proposition 5.4.
(3) $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}$, as a transition system (or part of one), is strongly extensional, by Corollary 5.6. This allows us to regard it as a subset of $\nu\mathcal{P}$ [ALM$^+$15].

It is natural to ask whether these properties hold at $i = \omega_1$. We answer these questions negatively, not only for $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}$ but even for $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$, by means of the following result.

Theorem 6.1. *There exists a* ghost $\in \nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$*, i.e. an element that is not* $0(\omega_1)$ *and has no successor.*

A "ghost" is so called because it "appears to be alive" in the sense that its 1-component is nonempty, yet is "dead" in the sense of having no successors.

Corollary 6.2.

(1) Some element of $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ is not in the range of $\nu^{(\omega_1+1\geqslant\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}$ and therefore not $\mathcal{P}$-coalgebraic.
(2) For every $j<\omega_1$, some $a\in\nu^{(j+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has an ω_1-development $b\in\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ such that a has a successor but b does not.
(3) $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, as a transition system, is not strongly extensional.

Proof. Let b be a ghost in $\nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$.

(1) If $b=\nu^{(\omega_1+1\geqslant\omega_1)}c$ for $c\in\nu^{(\omega_1+1)}\mathcal{P}$, then by Proposition 5.2, every element of c is a successor of b, so $c=\emptyset=0(\omega_1+1)$ so $b=0(\omega_1)$, contradiction.
(2) $\nu^{(\omega_1\geqslant j)}b$ is nonempty, because otherwise $\nu^{(\omega_1\geqslant 1)}b$ is empty, contradicting $b\neq 0(\omega_1)$. So it has an element, but its ω_1-development b has no successor.
(3) b and $0(\omega_1)$ are bisimilar, since each has no successor, but they are not equal. □

The rest of the section is devoted to proving Theorem 6.1. We make use of the standard notion of an "Aronszajn tree", but it will be convenient to include some extra properties.

Definition 6.3. A *tidy Aronszajn tree* is an chain $D : \omega_1^{\mathsf{op}}\to\mathbf{Set}$ with the following properties.

(1) $D_{i\geqslant j}: D_i\longrightarrow D_j$ is surjective for all $j\leqslant i<\omega_1$.
(2) D_i is countable for all $i<\omega_1$.
(3) The limit of D is empty.
(4) D_0 is singleton.
(5) For any limit ordinal $i<\omega_1$ and $x,y\in D_i$, if $D_{i\geqslant j}x=D_{i\geqslant j}y$ for all $j<i$ then $x=y$.

Theorem 6.4. *A tidy Aronszajn tree exists.*

Proof. See e.g. Theorem 2 in [Ber]. Although properties (4)–(5) are not mentioned there, the example given in the proof clearly satisfies them. □

Definition 6.5. An *embedded Aronszajn tree* consists of

- a tidy Aronszajn tree D
- injective maps $m_i : D_i\to\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, natural in i.

Lemma 6.6. *If an embedded Aronszajn tree exists, then Theorem 6.1 is true.*

Proof. Let (D,m) be an embedded Aronszajn tree. We may assume that each m_i is an inclusion. Thus for all $i<\omega_1$ countability of D_i gives $D_i\in\nu^{(i+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, and for $j\leqslant i<\omega_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu^{(i+1\geqslant j+1)}D_j &= (\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}\nu^{(i\geqslant j)})D_j \\
&= \{\nu^{(i\geqslant j)}x \mid x\in D_i\} \\
&= \{D_{i\geqslant j}x \mid x\in D_i\} && \text{by naturality of } m \\
&= D_j && \text{by surjectivity of } D_{i\geqslant j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence there is unique $a \in \nu^{(\omega_1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ such that $a_{i+1} = D_i$ for all $i < \omega_1$. Since $a_1 = D_0$, which is singleton, $a \neq 0(\omega_1)$. Suppose $a \rightsquigarrow b$. Then for all $i < \omega_1$ we have $b_i \in a_{i+1} = D_i$, and for $j \leqslant i < \omega_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i \geqslant j} b_j &= \nu^{(i \geqslant j)} b_j \quad \text{by naturality of } m \\ &= b_j \end{aligned}$$

So b is in the limit of D, contradiction. □

Lemma 6.7. *For all $i < \omega_1$, let* redness *be a predicate on $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$. Let this sequence of predicates have the following properties.*

- *$\nu^{(i \geqslant j)}$ preserves redness for all $j \leqslant i < \omega_1$.*
- *For a limit i, every element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ whose components are all red is red.*
- *In particular $() \in \nu^{(0)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ is red.*
- *For all $i < \omega$, every red element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has at least one red $i+1$-development.*
- *For all $\omega \leqslant i < \omega_1$, every red element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has infinitely many red $i+1$-developments.*

Then an embedded Aronszajn tree exists.

Proof. We first obtain a tidy Aronszajn tree D with Di singleton for all $i \leqslant \omega$. For this, we take a tidy Aronszajn tree C by Theorem 6.4, and set

$$\begin{aligned} D_i &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 \qquad (i < \omega) \\ D_{\omega+i} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_i \qquad (i < \omega_1) \end{aligned}$$

Next we construct for each $i < \omega_1$ an injection m_i from D_i to the set of red elements of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$. We proceed by induction on i, ensuring naturality wrt all $j \leqslant i$.

- We define m_i where i is a limit. For $x \in D_i$ there is unique $a \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ such that $a_j = m_j D_{i \geqslant j} x$ for all $j < i$, since we have naturality for $j \leqslant j' < i$. Then a is red since $m_j D_{i \geqslant j} x$ is red for all $j < i$, and we set $m_i x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a$. Injectivity of m_i is achieved because D enjoys property (5) in Definition 6.3.
- In particular $m_0() \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ()$.
- We define m_{i+1} where $i < \omega$. Writing c_i for the sole element of D_i, let $m_{i+1} c_{i+1}$ be some red $i+1$-development of $m_i c_i$.
- We define m_{i+1} where $\omega \leqslant i < \omega_1$. For any $x \in D_i$, the set U_x of $i+1$-developments of x is countable, and the set V_x of red $i+1$ developments of $m_i x$ is infinite, so there is an injection $I_x : U_x \to V_x$. For any $i+1$-development y of x put $m_{i+1} y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I_x y$, i.e. $m_{i+1} = \bigcup_{x \in D_i} I_x$. □

Our task therefore is to construct a suitable sequence of predicates.

Definition 6.8. We define the red elements of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, by induction on $i < \omega_1$.

- If $i < \omega_1$ is a limit ordinal, then $y \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ is red when all its components are.
- In particular, the sole element $()$ of $\nu^{(0)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ is red.
- The sole red element of $\nu^{(1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ is $\{()\}$.
- The sole red element of $\nu^{(2)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ is $\{\{()\}\}$.
- The sole red element of $\nu^{(3)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ is $\{\{\{()\}\}\}$.
- The three red elements of $\nu^{(4)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ are $\{\{\{\{()\}\}\}, \{\{\{\}\}\}\}$ and $\{\{\{\{()\}\}\}, \{\{\{\}\}, \{\{()\}\}\}\}$ and $\{\{\{\{()\}\}\}, \{\{\{\}, \{()\}\}\}\}$.

$\nu^{(1\geqslant 0)}$	$\{\}$	$\mapsto$	$()$
	Red $\{()\}$	$\mapsto$	$()$
$\nu^{(2\geqslant 1)}$	$\{\{\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{()\}$
	Red $\{\{()\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{()\}$
	$\{\{\},\{()\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{()\}$
$\nu^{(3\geqslant 2)}$	$\{\{\{\}\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{\{()\}\}$
	Red $\{\{\{()\}\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{\{()\}\}$
	$\{\{\{\}\},\{\{()\}\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{\{()\}\}$
	$\{\{\{\},\{()\}\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{\{()\}\}$
$\nu^{(4\geqslant 3)}$	Red $\{\{\{\{()\}\}\},\{\{\}\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{\{\{()\}\}\}$
	Red $\{\{\{\{()\}\}\},\{\{\}\},\{\{()\}\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{\{\{()\}\}\}$
	Red $\{\{\{\{()\}\}\},\{\{\},\{()\}\}\}$	$\mapsto$	$\{\{\{()\}\}\}$

Figure 1: Connecting maps preserve redness

- If $4 \leqslant i < \omega_1$, then an element $d \in \nu^{(i+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, i.e. a countable subset $d \subseteq \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, is red when the following conditions hold.
  - $\nu^{(i+1\geqslant i)}d$ is red.
  - d has a red element.
  - For any $j < i$, every red element of $\nu^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ that has an i-development $\in d$ has at least two red j-developments $\in d$.

Lemma 6.9. *If $j \leqslant i < \omega_1$ then $\nu^{(i\geqslant j)}$ preserves redness.*

Proof. Induction on i, using Figures 1 for $i \leqslant 4$. □

Lemma 6.10. *For $i < \omega_1$, every red element of $\nu^{(i+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has at least one red element.*

Proof.

- If $i \leqslant 3$, each red element of $\nu^{(i+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ contains the sole red element of $\nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$.
- If $i \geqslant 4$, this is part of the definition of redness. □

Lemma 6.11. *For $j \leqslant i < \omega_1$ and red $y \in \nu^{(j+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, every red element of $\nu^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ that has an i-development $\in y$ has at least one red i-development $\in y$.*

Proof.

- If $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, the sole element of y is red.
- If $i = 3$, there is only one red element of $\nu^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ and it has a red i-development in y, viz. $\{\{\{()\}\}\}$.
- If $i \geqslant 4$ and $j < i$, this is part of the definition of redness.
- The case $j = i$ is trivial. □

This allows us to cut down the third clause in the definition of redness for an element of $\nu^{(i+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$.

Lemma 6.12.

(1) Let i be the supremum of $i_0 < i_1 < \cdots$. An element $d \in \nu^{(i+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, i.e. a countable subset $d \subseteq \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, is red iff the following conditions hold.

- $\nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i)} d$ *is red.*
- *d has a red element.*
- *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, every red element of $\nu^{(i_n)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ that has an i-development $\in d$ has at least two red i-developments $\in d$.*

(2) Let $3 \leqslant k < \omega_1$. An element $d \in \nu^{(k+2)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, i.e. a countable subset $d \subseteq \nu^{(k+1)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, is red iff the following conditions hold.

- $\nu^{(k+2 \geqslant k+1)} d$ *is red.*
- *d has a red element.*
- *Every red element of $\nu^{(k)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ that has a $k+1$-development $\in d$ has at least two red $k+1$-developments $\in d$.*

Proof.

(1) Clearly redness implies these conditions. Conversely, suppose $j < i$ and $w \in \nu^{(j)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has an i-development $v \in d$. Pick $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $i_n \geqslant j$. Since w has an $i_n + 1$-development $\nu^{(i \geqslant i_n)} v \in \nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i_n+1)} d$, and the latter is red, w has by Lemma 6.11 a red $i_n + 1$-development $u \in \nu^{(i+1 \geqslant i_n+1)} d$. Since u has an i-development in d, it has at least two red i-developments in d, and these are also red i-developments of w.

(2) Similar, replacing i by $k+1$ and i_n by k. □

The following notation will be useful.

Definition 6.13.

(1) We write $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ for the set of bitstreams, and $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathsf{Recur}}$ for the subset consisting of those in which 1 occurs infinitely often.

(2) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\uparrow n$ for $\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \geqslant n\}$. We write $\{0,1\}^{\uparrow n}$ for the set of bitstreams indexed from n, and $\{0,1\}^{\uparrow n}_{\mathsf{NonRecur}}$ for the subset consisting of those in which 1 occurs only finitely often.

Lemma 6.14.

(1) For $j < i < \omega_1$, every red $x \in \nu^{(j)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has

- *at least one red i-development*
- *at least three red i-developments if $i \geqslant 4$*
- *at least continuum many red i-developments if $i \geqslant \omega$.*

(2) For $j \leqslant i < \omega_1$, every red $x \in \nu^{(j)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has at least one red i-development.

Proof. We proceed by induction on i. Clearly part (1) implies part (2), so we just prove part (1).

- If $i \leqslant 3$, the unique red element of $\nu^{(j)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has a unique red i-development.
- If $i = 4$, the unique red element of $\nu^{(j)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ has three red i-developments.
- Suppose $i = k + 2$, where $k \geqslant 3$. Then x has a red $k+1$-development y by the inductive hypothesis, part (2), because $j \leqslant k + 1$. It suffices to show that y has at least three red $k+2$-developments, and at least continuum if $k \geqslant \omega$. We first choose some elements.
  - Pick a red element z of y, by Lemma 6.10.
  - For each non-red $w \in y$, pick a $k+1$-development $f(w)$ of w. (Since k is a countable ordinal, $\nu^{(k+1 \geqslant k)}$ is surjective.)
  - For each red $w \in y$ other than z, pick distinct red $k+1$-developments $g(w), h(w)$ of w. (By the inductive hypothesis.)
  - Pick distinct red $k+1$-developments v, v', v'' of z. (By the inductive hypothesis.)

We claim that the three following subsets of $\nu^{(k+1)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$

$$\begin{aligned} r &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f(w) \mid \text{non-red } w \in y\} \cup \{g(w), h(w) \mid \text{red } w \in y, w \neq z\} \cup \{v', v''\} \\ r' &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f(w) \mid \text{non-red } w \in y\} \cup \{g(w), h(w) \mid \text{red } w \in y, w \neq z\} \cup \{v, v''\} \\ r'' &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f(w) \mid \text{non-red } w \in y\} \cup \{g(w), h(w) \mid \text{red } w \in y, w \neq z\} \cup \{v, v'\} \end{aligned}$$

are distinct red k+2-developments of y. Let us check redness of r using Lemma 6.12(1); the others are similar. It is countable because y is, so it is $\in \nu^{(k+2)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$. It is sent by $\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}\nu^{(k+1\geqslant k)}$ to y. It has a red element, v'. Any red $w \in \nu^{(k)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$ that has a $k+1$-development in r is $\in y$, and so has at least two red $k+1$-developments in r, viz. v' and v'' if $w = z$ and $g(w)$ and $h(w)$ otherwise.

If $k \geqslant \omega$, we proceed as follows.

- Let R be the set of red $k+1$-developments of z, which has size at least continuum. (By the inductive hypothesis.)
- Pick $u \in R$.

For each $e \in R \setminus \{u\}$, we claim that the following subset of $\nu^{(k+1)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$

$$r(e) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{f(w) \mid \text{non-red } w \in y\} \cup \{g(w), h(w) \mid \text{red } w \in y, w \neq z\} \cup \{u, e\}$$

is a red $k+2$-development of y. The argument is similar to the one we gave for r. Moreover $e \mapsto r(e)$ is injective, so y has at least continuum many red $k+2$-developments.

- Suppose $i = k+1$, where k is the supremum of $0 = k_0 < k_1 < \cdots$, with $k_1 \geqslant 4$. Then x has a red k-development y by the inductive hypothesis, part (2), because $j \leqslant k$. It suffices to show that y has at least continuum many red $k+1$-developments.

  We first choose some elements. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in y_{k_n+1}$.

  - In general, z has a k_{n+1}-development $\in y_{k_{n+1}+1}$. That is because

$$\begin{aligned} z &\in y_{k_n+1} \\ &= \nu^{(k_{n+1}+1 \geqslant k_n+1)} y_{k_{n+1}+1} \\ &= \{\nu^{(k_{n+1} \geqslant k_n)} w \mid w \in y_{k_{n+1}+1}\} \end{aligned}$$

  - If z is not red, pick one of these and call it $f(n, z)$.
  - If z is red, then, since y and hence $y_{k_{n+1}+1}$ are red and $k_{n+1} + 1 \geqslant 5$, we see that z has at least two red k_{n+1}-developments $\in y_{k_{n+1}+1}$. Pick two distinct ones and call them $f(n, z)$ and $f'(n, z)$.
  - Thus, whether or not z is red, $f(n, z)$ is a k_{n+1}-development of z in $y_{k_{n+1}+1}$.

  Again, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in y_{k_n+1}$.

  - For each natural number $m \geqslant n$, define $a_m \in \nu^{(k_m)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$ such that $a_m \in y_{k_m+1}$, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= z \\ a_{m+1} &= f(m, a_m) \quad \text{if } m \geqslant n \end{aligned}$$

    Since a_{m+1} is always a k_{m+1}-development of a_m, there is a unique $g(n, z) \in \nu^{(k)}\mathcal{P}_\mathsf{c}$ whose k_mth component is a_m for all $m \geqslant n$. Moreover $g(n, z)$ has the following properties.

    * It is a successor of y.
    * It is a k-development of z.

* If it is a k-development of $w \in \nu^{(k_p)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, for $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then $w \in y_{k_p+1}$. To see this, pick $m \geqslant n, p$, and then

$$\begin{aligned} w &= g(n,z)_{k_p} \\ &= \nu^{(k_m \geqslant k_p)} g(n,z)_{k_m} \\ &\in (\mathcal{P}\nu^{(k_m \geqslant k_p)}) y_{k_m+1} \quad (\text{since } g(n,z)_{k_m} \in y_{k_m+1}) \\ &= \nu^{(k_m+1 \geqslant k_p+1)} y_{k_m+1} \\ &= y_{k_p+1} \end{aligned}$$

– Suppose z is red and $r \in \{0,1\}^{\uparrow n}$. Then for each $m \geqslant n$, define $b_m \in \nu^{(k_m)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ such that $b_m \in y_{k_m+1}$ and b_m is red, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} b_n &= z \\ b_{m+1} &= f(m, b_m) \text{ if } m \geqslant n \text{ and } r_m = 0 \\ b_{m+1} &= f'(m, b_m) \text{ if } m \geqslant n \text{ and } r_m = 1 \end{aligned}$$

Since b_{m+1} is always a k_{m+1}-development of b_m, there is a unique $h(n,z,r) \in \nu^{(k)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ whose k_mth component is b_m for all $m \geqslant n$. Moreover $h(n,z,r)$ has the following properties.

* It is a successor of y.
* It is a red k-development of z.
* If it is a k-development of $w \in \nu^{(k_p)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, for $p \in \mathbb{N}$, then $w \in y_{k_p+1}$. Similar proof to the one for $g(n,z)$.

– If z is red then $g(n,z) = h(n,z,(0)_{m \geqslant n})$.

The functions g and h have the following "separation" properties:

– $h(n,z,r) \neq h(p,w,s)$ if $r_m \neq s_m$ for some $m \geqslant n, p$.
– $h(n,z,r) \neq g(p,w)$ if $r_m = 1$ for some $m \geqslant n, p$.

We prove the former; the latter is similar. Suppose that $r_m = 0$ and $s_m = 1$ for some $m \geqslant n, p$, and $c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h(n,z,r) = h(p,w,s)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} c_{k_{m+1}} &= h(n,z,r)_{k_m+1} \\ &= f(m, h(n,z,r)_{k_m}) \\ &= f(m, c_{k_m}) \end{aligned}$$

and likewise $c_{k_{m+1}} = f'(m, c_{k_m})$, but $f(m, c_{k_m}) \neq f'(m, c_{k_m})$, contradiction.

Let $r \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathsf{Recur}}$. We define $H(r) \subseteq \nu^{(k)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ to be

$$\begin{gathered} \{g(n,z) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, y_{k_n+1}\} \\ \cup \{h(n,z,s) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{red } z \in y_{k_n+1}, s \in \{0,1\}^{\uparrow n}_{\mathsf{NonRecur}}\} \\ \cup \{h(0,(),r)\} \end{gathered}$$

Speaking of $h(0,(),r)$ requires $()$ to be a red element of y_1. And it is: since y is red, y_1 is too and so must be $\{()\}$.

We claim $H(r)$ is a red $k+1$-development of y using Lemma 6.12(1). Firstly it is countable since $\{0,1\}^{\uparrow c}_{\mathsf{NonRecur}}$ is, so $H(r) \in \nu^{(k+1)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$. To show it is a $k+1$-development of y, we apply Proposition 5.2: every element is a successor of y, and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ every $z \in y_{k_n+1}$ has a k-development in $H(r)$, viz. $g(n,z)$. It has a red element viz. $h(0,(),r)$. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and red $w \in \nu^{(k_p)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, if w has a k-development in $H(r)$

then $w \in y_{k_p+1}$, so w has at least two—indeed infinitely many—red k-developments in $H(r)$, viz. $h(p, w, s)$ for all $s \in \{0,1\}^{\uparrow c}_{\mathsf{NonRecur}}$, distinct by the separation property of h.

The map $r \mapsto H(r)$ is injective. To see this, let $r \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathsf{Recur}}$.

- We cannot have $h(0,(),r) = g(n,z)$ because (since 1 occurs infinitely often in r) there exists $m \geqslant n$ such that $r_m = 1$.
- We cannot have $h(0,(),r) = h(n,z,s)$ where $s \in \{0,1\}^{\uparrow n}_{\mathsf{NonRecur}}$ because (since 1 occurs infinitely often in r and only finitely often in s) there exists $m \geqslant n$ such that $r_m = 1$ and $s_m = 0$.
- We cannot have $h(0,(),r) = h(0,(),r')$ for $r' \neq r$.

So $h(0,(),r) \notin H(r')$ for all $r' \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathsf{Recur}}$ distinct from r.

Since $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}_{\mathsf{Recur}}$ has size continuum, y has at least continuum many red $k+1$-developments.

- If i is a positive limit, it is the supremum of a sequence $j = i_0 < i_1 < \cdots$, with $i_1 \geqslant 4$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and red $z \in \nu^{(i_n)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$, pick (by the inductive hypothesis, using $i_{n+1} \geqslant 4$) distinct red i_{n+1}-developments $f(n,z)$ and $f'(n,z)$ of z.

  Suppose $r \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define red $a_n \in \nu^{(i_n)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= y \\ a_{n+1} &= f(n, a_n) \text{ if } r_n = 0 \\ a_{n+1} &= f'(n, a_n) \text{ if } r_n = 1 \end{aligned}$$

  Since a_{n+1} is always an i_{n+1}-development of a_n, there is a unique $g(r) \in \nu^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{c}}$ whose i_nth component is a_n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence $g(r)$ is a red i-development of y. Clearly $r \mapsto g(r)$ is injective, and $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ has continuum size, so y has at least continuum many red i-developments. □

Lemma 6.14 tells us that redness satisfies the conditions of Lemma 6.7, implying that an embedded Aronszajn tree exists. By Lemma 6.6, we conclude that Theorem 6.1 is true. □

References

[Abr05] Samson Abramsky. A Cook's tour of the finitary non-well-founded sets. In Sergei N. Artëmov, Howard Barringer, Artur S. d'Avila Garcez, Luís C. Lamb, and John Woods, editors, *We Will Show Them! Essays in Honour of Dov Gabbay, Volume One*, pages 1–18. College Publications, 2005.

[Adá74] Jiří Adámek. Free algebras and automata realizations in the language of categories. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae*, 15(3):589–609, 1974.

[ALM+15] Jiří Adámek, Paul Blain Levy, Stefan Milius, Lawrence S. Moss, and Lurdes Sousa. On final coalgebras of power-set functors and saturated trees - to george janelidze on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 23(4):609–641, 2015.

[Bar93] Michael Barr. Terminal coalgebras in well-founded set theory. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 114(2):299–315, 21 June 1993.

[Ber] George Bergman. Some empty inverse limits. Manuscript available at `http://math. berkeley. edu/~gbergman/papers/unpub/emptylim. pdf`.

[CUV09] V. Capretta, T. Uustalu, and V. Vene. Corecursive algebras: A study of general structured corecursion. In M. Oliveira and J. Woodcock, editors, *SBMF*, volume 5902 of *LNCS*, pages 84–100. Springer, 2009.

[Epp99] Adam Eppendahl. Coalgebra-to-algebra morphisms. *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci*, 29:42–49, 1999.

[FH89] Marco Forti and Furio Honsell. *Models of Self-Descriptive Set Theories*, pages 473–518. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1989.

[KV04] Clemens Kupke, Alexander Kurz 0001, and Yde Venema. Stone coalgebras. *Theor. Comput. Sci*, 327(1-2):109–134, 2004.

[LR96] R. S. Lazic and A. W. Roscoe. On transition systems and non-well-founded sets. In *Papers on General Topology and Applications: 11th Summer Conference at the University of Southern Maine, 1995 Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, volume 806, pages 238–264, 1996.

[Tay99] P. Taylor. *Practical Foundations of Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[Wor05] J. Worrell. On the final sequence of a finitary set functor. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 338(1–3):184–199, June 2005.